| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that developing countries have a "right to pollute" the environment |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  Good call-out that Opp ignored your principle argument, then immediately conclude that your winning pathway is just proving that the right to pollute ought to exist, so if the principle stands, then Prop still wins the debate.   * Good job signposting.   Good pushback that there are other human costs due to the loss of livelihoods and development, and the money generated by the state can be used to supplement the healthcare system.   * We can also point out that we likely will not engage in the kind of economic development that also kills off our own people, that would be entirely counterproductive.   + Opp’s whole argument is contingent on very specific methods of development such as deforestation.   + Here, we can clarify that the state doesn’t have to pursue unfettered, extreme pollution while in pursuit of economic development.   It isn’t clear why the opportunity cost had to be people dying from the lack of economic development. We need more mechanistic analysis why these developing nations only have comparative advantage in the manufacturing industry, thus will have little to no alternative economic plan.   * E.g. Large-scale jobs at an entry-level can only exist exclusively via manufacturing.   While I agree that it’s not financially viable to engage in the green transition at the same time as economic development, we need to engage with Opp’s counterfactual!   * They proposed things like green tech transfer to developing nations.   + Point out that none of these mechs are even exclusive, so we can have tech transfer while allowing developing nations to pollute.   + We need to break down why Opp’s suggestions of development aid would not be enough to reach this baseline development.   + You did a good job proving more harm than good, but it isn’t clear that after your level of baseline development, that this same disastrous society would then choose to embrace the green transition.   We have to engage with Opp’s main harm on the climate apocalypse.   * We need to be more comparative and explain why there is still time for these developing nations to catch up to the green transition after taking their time to accumulate their wealth first.   + Only then, you can use the weighing of having wealth as a prerequisite towards the green transition.   Well done reinforcing the principle argument! We are missing strategic framing as to why this positive contribution wins the debate vs Opp being most proximate to solving the environment.   * I appreciate the call-out that it isn’t clear that Opp actually solves anything, but they are definitely the closest to any kind of collective action to protect the environment. * While I appreciate the obligation of the state angle, it isn’t comparative to the state obligation to prevent complete environmental disaster either. Why does one outweigh the other?   Good strategic angle of economic development precedes environmental protection, but as per Opp’s first argument, do we have the time to allow this development to continue?   * A lot of the development analysis became more and more repetitive as the speech went on.   Nice moral rhetoric on reparations and what is owed to developing nations! Can you conclude clearly here that all Prop has to prove is that they deserve the EQUAL right to pollute the way developed nations have?  Good job offering POIs today!  8.05 | | | | | | |